

The Christian Statesman

Vol. XLV.

APRIL, 1911.

No. 4.

The Outlook.

A few years ago we conducted an earnest campaign to prevent the admission of Mr. Smoot to the Senate of the United States. These efforts were based, not on the charge that Mr. Smoot himself was a polygamist, which we never affirmed, but on the ground that he was and is an official representative of a disloyal, law-defying organization known as the Mormon Church. For forty years the nation had been engaged in a strenuous conflict with the system of polygamy established by the Mormons. In that struggle the moral and Christian forces of the nation had at last triumphed. Utah being still a territory was under the government of Congress. The Edmunds-Tucker law had been enacted imposing severe penalties for contracting polygamous marriages or maintaining polygamous relations. Under this law, the leading polygamists were in exile, fugitives from justice, or were in prison. The property of the so-called church was confiscated, and in possession of the government. Then the Mormons professed to receive a revelation from God authorizing them to suspend the practice of polygamy. With the most solemn protestations they declared their purpose to abandon plural marriages and to obey the law of the land. The nation and Congress accepted the decision as sincere. The long struggle it was felt was over. Full faith and credit was accorded to the professions of

the Mormon leaders. The convicted polygamists were pardoned by the President's proclamation of amnesty. The escheated property was restored to the church. Utah was admitted to statehood. One of her earliest acts was to send Mr. Brigham H. Roberts, an actual polyamist and a zealous upholder of the system, to Congress as a Representative. He was overwhelmingly rejected by the lower House. Then Mr. Smoot was elected Senator. At this point the campaign we have spoken of was launched. Petitions were circulated by the thousands, and adopted by hundreds of thousands of citizens. Other organizations, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Woman's Home Missionary Societies, and others, were active in the fight. Evidence accumulated that polygamy was not abandoned. Joseph F. Smith, the head of the Mormon church, admitted in his testimony before the Senate Committee, that nearly one thousand polygamous families were still living in violation of the law. In the face of this evidence, the Senate voted to seat Mr. Smoot mainly on the strength of the argument presented by Senator Knox of Pennsylvania that the Constitution forbids the application of any religious test. A more unfair argument was never presented in any legislative body. The petitions against Mr. Smoot had not argued against him on the ground of his religion, but on account of the disloyalty and disobedience to law of the system of which he was an official representative.

And now in recent numbers of McClure's, Everybody's and the Cosmopolitan magazines, all the arguments which we urged in that long discussion are abundantly vindicated. On the testimony of witnesses within the church it is shown that there was no sincerity in their professed abandonment of polygamy. The pretended revelation from heaven was only a ruse to secure amnesty for their past offences and to gain admission to statehood. By that admission Utah passed from under the authority of Congress and became a state, entitled to regulate her own domestic institutions. The solemn covenant with the nation, in the terms of the enabling act, whereby the people of Utah engaged to abandon the practice of polygamy and to prohibit it by the laws and Constitution of their State, have been discounted by the claim that as a promise made under duress or constraint is not binding, Utah is not morally bound by this agreement. All this was urged before the admission of the Senator from Utah, and all this is now vindicated and confirmed in these magazine discussions. One of these writers refers to a list of more than two hundred polygamous marriages, contracted since the manifesto against polygamy. The list was published in the Salt Lake Tribune, and while the publisher has been bitterly assailed for publishing the results of his investigations, the correctness of his charges has never been denied. It remains to be seen whether the nation has the conscience and the courage necessary to enable her to deal the one decisive blow which would destroy this "viper on the hearth," and save our imperilled institutions—the adoption, while yet it is possible, of an anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

For generations Protestantism, and especially Calvinism and Puritanism, have been charged with

A Great Protestant Painter indifference if not hostility to the beautiful in nature and in art. And

now in France, the home of artistic culture, there has arisen a great painter, M. Eugene Burnaud, who is a Protestant of Protestants, but whose work commands the admiration and homage not only of France but of Europe. An article in the Record of Christian Work, from whose pages for January we gather the facts set forth in this item, speaks as follows of the providential timeliness of the rise of this great teacher: "The men at the head of the French nation have made the destruction not merely of the parasite clericalism but of religion itself, the tree on which it grows, the first article of their program. They have loaded carts with crucifixes taken from the law courts, casting them into the lumber rooms of museums. They have purged the children's school books of all references to God. They have sought to crush Christian missions in the colonies. They have aimed to rid France of every trace of Christian teaching, and then—just at this juncture there is raised up an incomparable witness to the power and winsomeness of that teaching, the form of whose testimony is peculiarly fitted to appeal to the highly sensitized French mind."

M. Burnaud has been a prolific painter. Among his works are eighty-four paintings illustrating the parables of our Lord, and another series illustrating Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. This immortal work is thus receiving such an eloquent interpretation as its author certainly never dreamed of

The intellectual power and moral earnestness of M. Burnaud appear not only in his paintings but in his addresses. Some years ago he was called to address a gathering of Christian students in Switzerland, and chose for his subject "The Religious Art of Italy." In this address he made the following confession of his own evangelical faith: "I, for my part, believe in the reality of the evangelical facts. I hold as truth the enunciation to the shepherd, the miraculous birth of the Saviour, His resurrection, His ascension in triumph. I believe that the supernatural which man needs in his inmost being was realized at a certain moment of history. I believe that the veil which hides the beyond from us was raised and that the eyes of the shepherds beheld those unspeakable glories which hedge us in, little as we know it."

In the remainder of the address the speaker pleaded for the restoration in the whole domain of art of the deeply religious spirit in which the greatest triumphs of art have been heretofore achieved. "The blessed Angelico painted immortal pictures under the direct inspiration of the Most High. Shall there not be among the artists of the twentieth century some who will seek in personal communion with God, in the

discipline of the gospel fully accepted, a new vigor—who will place the heart out of which are the issues of life under the constant influence of the Holy Spirit? How many talents to-day wasted, how many energies vainly expended, how much power uselessly employed, would then become fertile for the kingdom of God! * * * And what is true of artists is true in all directions of human activity. There is a diversity of gifts but one Spirit. Why should men wish to limit the authority of faith to domains purely moral or religious? All forms of human thought have a right to its fertilizing influence. The Kingdom of God will be the reassumption by the Creator of His entire universe. Let us accustom ourselves to this thought. Let us lift our enthusiasms to the height of this hope. Let us work in the measure of our strength to bring back into each of His provinces—poetry, science, all life—that Sovereign who has been driven out by human pride"

These wise and weighty words deserve thoughtful attention. They vindicate and justify the movement to which THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN is devoted, a movement whose aim is to bring back the true Sovereign into the domain of law and government.

Editorial Articles.

Another Vice President Departed.

One of the most steadfast and cordial friends of the National Reform work for nearly thirty years was Bishop O. W. Whitaker, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who died recently in Philadelphia. His interest in our work dated from the early days of our agita-

tion of divorce reform, but gradually extended to cover the whole work of the Association. In his last years he became nearly blind, but continued in a wonderful way to keep in touch with his church work and with public affairs. One of the last acts of his life was the sending of his contribution for the cur-

rent year to the cause of National Reform. He was a man of wide sympathies, of great practical wisdom, a lover of peace, a friend of good men in whatever branch of the Church they are found and an active supporter of every good cause which solicited his coöperation. His death is lamented by Christian citizens irrespective of their Church relations. Some years ago the diocese chose the Rev. Alexander Mackey-Smith to be Bishop-Coadjutor, and he becomes now sole Bishop of the diocese. Bishop Mackey-Smith has also lent his active support to our cause.

Death of the Rev. R. J. George, D.D.

The Rev. Dr. R. J. George, Professor of Theology in the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary in Pittsburgh, died at his home in that city on the 11th of last month. Failing strength during a period of nearly two years had given intimation of the approaching end, but he was able to continue his labors as professor until the mid-winter holidays, just before his death.

Dr. George was endowed with a rare power of effective appeal, both in written and spoken utterance. He was an eloquent and persuasive preacher of the gospel, and an able advocate of any cause which enlisted his powers. His services to the cause of National Reform for many years deserve cordial recognition in this hour of his departure. His eloquent voice was heard in many of our conventions. He was Recording Secretary and Secretary of the Executive Committee for many years. His zeal and fidelity and accuracy in these positions were greatly helpful to the work and their value was constantly recognized. In later years some differ-

ences of opinion with his brethren led him to transfer his active labors to other lines of reform work, but his interest in the fundamental Christian principles of civil government was never lessened. To these principles he adhered with passionate devotion, and to the very close of his life he employed all his great powers in advocating them. His eyes now behold the glory of the King whose claims he so zealously maintained during his life. It is a happy thought that we are all nearing, and that some of us are nearer, no doubt, than we think, to the brightness of that perfect light in which all misunderstandings shall pass away forever.

The New Work Laid on the National Reform Association.

The success of the World's Christian Citizenship Conference last fall wrought a great change in the outlook of the National Reform Association and greatly increased its responsibilities. It revealed the fact that there are many Christian citizens in other nations who are ready to accept the message of this Association, and to stand with us on the platform of the authority of Jesus Christ over national life and of Christianity as affording the solution of all national problems. Very specially is this true of the great body of Christian missionaries. Since this door has been so manifestly set open before us, it is plainly the duty of this Association to carry this message to all nations. We must give the truth an opportunity to reach and sift the hearts of men, to discover and draw to itself those who are prepared to receive it and to become advocates and witnesses for it. From being a body sim-

ply of American citizens maintaining certain principles in their application to American institutions and advocating certain reforms in our own nation, we find ourselves definitely called, under the obligation of a providential opportunity, to carry this work into all nations. It may be said, we are but few, and poorly qualified, and have no adequate resources for such a task. None feel this more deeply than the members and officers of this Association themselves. But was not all this true of the first foreign missionaries and of the early Christian disciples? We believe this message and the work to which it summons those who embrace it to be an integral part of the great salvation, and included, as well as the gospel for individual men, in the command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." And the opportunity which has been opened before the friends of national reformation carries with it as well-defined an obligation as did the open doors of the Roman empire in the years which followed the resurrection of Christ.

Not only in all the world but in the United States has a new opportunity been opened before us and a new obligation created for us, but in our own country as well. The conference unanimously and cordially requested the National Reform Association to prosecute in this country the reformation of our corrupt divorce laws, and the defence of the Bible and other Christian elements of our public school education. No suggestion was made that some other agency might more suitably or more effectively undertake such tasks. Nor was any such suggestion made, in any quarter during all the months of

preparation for the conference, or since. We had expected it, but no such voice was heard. By its literature and its popular conventions, its watchfulness against the assaults made on our national Christianity and the courage and vigor with which it has repelled them, the National Reform Association has won for itself an acknowledged place as the chief guardian of these interests in the United States. If we shall worthily discharge the grave responsibilities thus imposed, we shall win the gratitude of our countrymen and the approval and blessing of God. If we fail, God will raise up some other more faithful and more obedient instrument of his will.

The Tercentenary of the English Bible.

The translation of the Bible into English, commonly called King James' version, which for three hundred years has been the accepted version of English-speaking peoples, was first published in 1611. The present year is, therefore, the three hundredth anniversary of that event. When we recall the various versions which preceded it, the difficulties under which they were produced, and the persecutions endured by the first translators, we see with what fitness the Protestant world addresses itself to the celebration of this occasion.

The first formal celebration has already been held in Canada where a new Bible house was last month dedicated in Toronto, and great assemblies were held in Toronto and Montreal. The Lord's day, March 26, has been chosen for this observance in Great Britain and Ireland. Ministers of all churches are asked to take as the topic of their sermons on that day the debt of English-

speaking people to the English Bible and to make an appeal that the Bible be given, both in the home and in the nation, its rightful place. The king has promised to receive a deputation, possibly in the week preceding. The deputation will present to him an address, stating in simple, dignified terms the meaning of the celebration and the king will reply stating his own attitude toward the cause. "In this way," says the Bible Society Record, "the crown will be linked with the Church and the people in recognizing the place of the Bible in the national life."

The American Bible Society is promoting diligently the suitable commemoration of this anniversary in the United States. It has published a bibliography of books relating to the history of the English Bible. This can be obtained on application to the secretaries at the Bible House, New York.

This tercentenary ought to lead to a greatly increased use of the Bible by the American people. We note with great pleasure many forces which are working together for this result. The Quiet Hour work of the Christian Endeavor societies has enlisted a multitude of young people under the pledge to pray and read a portion of the Bible every day. The same societies are also promoting earnestly the observance of family worship and large numbers of families which have been formed by the union of Christian young people have begun their married life with a family altar in the home through the influence of their Christian Endeavor or training. The World's Sunday School Association has organized the Family Worship League with the same end in view. The Gideons, an organization composed of

Christian commercial travelers, has been engaged in placing Bibles in the bedrooms of hotels, and has just placed an additional order for one hundred thousand Bibles to be used in this way. Mary Garden, the actress, said the other day in Philadelphia to a reporter who called on her: "You can't guess what book I have been reading. It is the Bible. I never read it before. I stole this copy from a hotel in New York and brought it with me. I have gotten as far as Abraham, and I find it intensely interesting." The Pocket New Testament League is enlisting everybody possible under a promise to carry a New Testament always, in the pocket or in a handbag, and to read it in leisure moments. All these forms of effort are reasonable and commendable, and all will accomplish good.

There is one field in which we hope that this tercentenary celebration will accomplish marked results. The discussion, through so many channels, of the place of the Bible in national life, of its effect on human liberty and in the development of free institutions, its influence on the English language and on English literature, will set in a clearer light than before the folly and sin of those who are engaged in driving the Bible from the public schools and even, as in Illinois, forbidding it to be found in school libraries. Christian citizens could do no work more appropriate to this anniversary year, and could render no more valuable service to the nation than by a quiet, judicious effort to secure the reading of the Bible in all public schools where there is no legal or other obstacle to its use.

The National Reform Association has a very considerable body of literature on

the school question. One leaflet, "The One Bible," by Prof. Tayler Lewis, is of peculiar value and appropriateness in connection with this anniversary. We urge all Christian pastors into whose hands these words may come to secure

the bibliography of the American Bible Society referred to above, and to secure some of the historical and other helps which it announces, and then, in a sermon or series of sermons, to improve to the uttermost this great occasion.

Contributed Articles.

The French Nation and Christianity*

BY OTHON GUERLAC,

Cornell University, formerly of Paris, France.

It might as well be stated frankly at the outset: An impartial and objective survey of the present-day France in her relations to Christianity can bring neither comfort nor encouragement to the members of this conference. On all but a very few of the principles laid down in your program of united action the trend of French political development has been away from the ideals that animate this body.

For reasons that will have to be touched upon later, neither the letter nor the spirit of the French constitution, neither the laws nor the law-makers, neither the dominant party nor the mass of the people, are in sympathy with this movement. Indeed, if one thing can be said to characterize the policy of the present regime during the last forty years, it is a resolute, consistent, stubborn, almost morbid intent to divorce not merely the State from the Church, but the State from religion in any form and of any kind. The enemies of the republic, in and out of France, have accused it of being anti-religious. Just four years ago, November 9, 1906, dur-

ing a debate on the separation, a deputy, who since has become prime minister, answered that accusation by coining a French word with Greek prefix. He said that the State to-day was not anti-religious, but a-religious. I would like to show in rapid historic sketch that that is so, and perhaps explain why it is so.

The origin and growth of this policy of State neutrality could easily be traced to the ancient regime; but we shall long eschew historical discourses; we are concerned only with contemporary conditions. In fact it is in the nineteenth century—in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, that the evolution reached its climax.

Three simple facts will illustrate this progress.

The first chart granted after the fall of Napoleon in June, 1814, mentioned the Roman Catholic religion as the "religion of France." In fact the government of the Restoration favored that religion with such partiality that it precipitated its own destruction.

The second chart, accepted sixteen years later, in 1830, mentioned it only as the religion "professed by the majority of the French." And under that regime violent hostility to the Church was not uncommonly displayed.

*Paper read at the World's Christian Citizenship Conference, held in Philadelphia, Pa., Nov. 16-20, 1910.

The constitution which now governs France, that of 1875, contains no reference whatever to any religion. It had, to be sure, in the section relating to Parliament, a paragraph which read like this: "On the Sunday following the meeting of the two Houses, public prayers will be addressed to God in the churches and the temples to call for His assistance in the work of the assemblies."

Nine years later, in August, 1884, when the constitution was revised, this paragraph was struck out. A well-known Christian pastor, Edmond de Pressense, then a senator, supported this measure by a speech—a fact which gives it its true significance.

These three facts show the steady progress towards absolute secularization of the State, which was to be the dominant feature of the last and of this century. But it was not until the third republic, and at a special date of the third republic, that the movement took its full force and was carried to its completion.

The date is 1879 and the cause was only too evident. France had just had a short experience of what the politicians then called "the government of priests." From 1870 to 1879 the republic had been ruled by an administration that was both monarchical and clerical. Its record was of a kind that France did not soon forget.

Political agitation to restore the temporal power of the Pope, erection by law on one of the hills that command Paris of a church devoted to the worship of the Sacred Heart, control of all the public schools by priests who taught the Roman catechism to children of Protestants and non-believers, creation of army chaplains to increase the influence of the Church with the military, establishment

of Catholic universities, with the privilege of granting degrees,—until then and ever since, a monopoly of the State—such were some of the features of the regime that obtained under the banner of the republic.

Free-thinkers and Protestants were discriminated against. In some cities their funerals were forbidden in day time. The sale and circulation of Protestant books, the holding of Protestant meetings were interfered with. Father Hyacinthe's voice was silenced in Paris. In a book that appeared the other day, Professor Bracq, of Vassar College, mentions a friend of his who was dragged from court to court in Southern France for having carried on a Protestant propaganda.

It is this policy of tyranny and intolerance, this confusion of the religious and the secular, this conspiracy of monarchists and clerics against the republic that became known as Clericalism and aroused an anger and distrust that have not yet abated and may be considered the direct cause of the reaction that followed. It was the Republican orator, Gambetta, who had uttered in the House the famous war cry, "Clericalism is the foe," who led the movement and toured the country, stirring up the passions of the masses against this black peril. The result was that in 1879 the clerical party by losing the presidency and the senate, lost its last support and the whole government passed over to the Republicans.

From that time down to the present day the pendulum has been swinging in the other direction—one long, continuous curve that has not yet reached its maximum height. Beginning with 1880, the Catholic Church sees wrested from her, one after another, all the privileges or

advantages previously gained. Divided on everything else, the Republicans were united on one point—the necessity of eliminating from the machinery of government all traces of ecclesiastical control or influence. That is what is known as the policy of laicisation, and that policy is to this day considered the corner-stone of the third republic. The councils of public instruction had ecclesiastic members. They are removed. (February 29, 1880.) The Catholic universities had received the right to confer degrees. It is withdrawn (March 18, 1880). Certain religious communities—illegally constituted, like the Jesuits—were holding school in defiance of the law—a law passed by the monarchy. This law is enforced. (Decree of March 29, 1880.) Many public schools were run by priests or Christian brothers, monks or nuns who taught Roman doctrines to the children of free-thinkers or non-conformists. The teaching of the catechism in public schools is prohibited by the law of March 28th, 1882, and a system of universal, free, undenominational instruction established.

The friars and sisters who until then had been allowed to teach without diplomas were obliged to take examinations like lay teachers: "a few yards of black cloth," to use the words of the historian, Duruy, no longer took the place of a degree guaranteeing the capacity to instruct the young.

Some years later, the law of October, 1886, decided that all public schools should be taught by lay teachers, awaiting the time when a more radical and perhaps less justifiable law, that of 1904, would deprive members of religious communities from giving any secular instruction whatsoever. The movement of laicisation took forms that were unex-

pected and perhaps unreasonable. Public prayers for the State were abolished. The army chaplains were suppressed. The nuns of some hospitals were replaced by lay nurses without always great benefit to the patients. In all cities the mayors had, and in many cities they exercised, the right to prohibit religious processions. Divorce, forbidden by the Church, was voted in 1884, and made still easier in 1908. Cremation, which is frowned upon, was made legal.

In 1889 the theological students, assimilated to all other students, were obliged to serve one year in the army. Since 1905 this year was raised to two years for all citizens alike.

There were still, however, a few traces of religious observance that had been overlooked by the apostles of laicisation. The radical and anti-clerical government of M. Combes (1902-1905) took care of those. The courts had the habit every year of opening their regular winter sittings by the celebration of a mass. This ceremony was abolished. Crucifixes which had been removed from the schools were still hanging in the court rooms; in April, 1904, they were taken away.

Likewise the navy, a very conservative body, had retained some old traditions, such as the religious baptism of ships and the celebration of Good Friday. The radical Minister Pelletan, an old-fashioned anti-clerical, while at the head of that department, ruthlessly suppressed these customs. There were also some naval hospitals nursed by nuns; they were secularized (1903).

Then came the last two blows that have been most sorely felt—the Association Law of 1901-1904, which practically ruined monasticism in France and withdrew the right of teaching from all mem-

M
 bers of religious communities; and the law of December, 1905, on disestablishment, which gave the signal of separation of Church and State in Continental Europe and marked the climax of this relentless movement of estrangement between the two rival powers that had long been allies and now were bitter foes. Both these measure were wrought with much suffering, much financial loss and moral distress for the Catholics who lost partly by their fault, partly by the severity of the law, millions of dollars and 20,000 parish schools.

How are we to explain this movement? Is it, as some would have it, a movement intended to "de-Christianize France" and eradicate all religion from the minds of its people?

This explanation has been widely given by the Catholics of France and by their friends outside and could be supported by abundant, if not decisive, evidence. In the February number of *The North American Review* for 1910, a lady whose religious affiliations are no secret to the general public, Mrs. Maria Bellamy Storer, developed that theme with a great array of texts that are accurate and commentaries that are more impassioned than judicious. Yes, it is only fair to acknowledge that there is a party in France that frankly, brutally and often fanatically has advocated a policy of aggressive and destructive atheism. It would be easy to quote articles from the press, addresses from political meetings, speeches from Parliament that might lead one to believe that that party has both strength and authority. Those, however, who are conversant with the real facts know how misleading such a conclusion would be. The most characteristic text that can be quoted is from a speech delivered by the

Socialist, Viviani, a very ardent and rhetorical speaker, who in November, 1906, rehearsing before the House the effects of socialistic propaganda on the workingman, said: "We have bound ourselves * * * to a work of anticlericalism and irreligion. We have torn the minds of men from religious faith * * * Together, and with a majestic gesture, we have put out in the heavens lights that will never be lit again."

This rather bold metaphor may be, and is, indeed, characteristic of the socialistic and perhaps freemasonic propaganda. But although uttered by a man who until a few weeks ago was a member of the cabinet, it is not characteristic of the policy of the republic towards the Church. In fact, neither the spirit nor the letter of the law of public instruction were hostile to God. While the law of 1882 provided for undenominational education, it did not exclude those general moral or religious principles that are common to all religions. Thus the authors of the law were not adverse to having taught in the schools "Our duties toward God." The instructions written for the teachers state that they must teach reverence for God and "obedience to His laws, such as they are revealed to him by his conscience and his reason." "The teacher should avoid, as he would a bad action, anything, in his language or attitude, which might wound the religious beliefs of the children confided to his care." (Official Instructions.)

Out of twenty text-books on the subject used in public schools and examined by Professor Bracq, sixteen taught this doctrine; four, only, eluded it altogether. However, through the lack of vigilance of the administration, some unfor-

fortunate excesses have been committed. In late years it has transpired not merely that some teachers and some authors have sedulously avoided any reference to the name of God, but that some publishers have printed new editions of text-books where all mentions of God, immortality of the soul or prayer were expurgated. This attempt, at once futile and unfair, to eliminate from the pupil's mind all religious associations has been denounced this very year at the tribune of the Parliament and condemned by the good sense of the majority. For this, too, is only the work of a small but aggressive element which, either through atheistic zeal or through scruples of exaggerated neutrality, has thrown discredit on the very principles that inspired these laws. The tendency, however, towards what the philosopher, Fossillee, calls "philosophical neutrality," is very strong and will, ultimately, win. See A. Fossillee: "*Demoralie politique et sociale on France* (Alcan.) P. 132 and 39.

The lay spirit is not at bottom an irreligious spirit. It has its origin in the Scriptural distinction between the realm of God and that of Caesar. It had its first representatives, Guizot tells us, in an age of universal faith, at the end of the thirteenth century; there were kings, jurists and statesmen. It was professed and is professed to-day by many sincere Christians.

Some of the most extreme forms of this spirit and some of its most striking consequences must be traced, not so much to irreligion as to that passion for logic and that "intellectual candor" that M. Barrett Wendell, after so many others, has ascribed to the French.

They approach problems a little differently from the Anglo-Saxon. Given a

principle of politics—admitted on both sides of the ocean, such as that of neutrality of the State, separation of Church and State—in America it will be qualified in practice by concessions and compromise, prayers in Congress, Thanksgiving proclamations, addresses of the presidents before religious bodies, discriminations in favor of church buildings. In France, on the contrary, the principle will be carried to its utmost limits. If the president of the republic in a speech to-day dared as much as mention the name of God there would be to-morrow an interpellation in the House and the ministers might endanger the existence of the cabinet by condoning this gross violence of official neutrality.

Finally it must be acknowledged that in Roman Catholic countries anti-clericalism is a form of liberalism. In our days when the Church came to cast its lot with the regimes of the past, with antiquated ideals of government and lost causes, the liberal spirit affected, in all Catholic countries, the anti-clerical form, so remarkable to-day in Spain, Italy or Portugal. Anti-clerical outbursts always have followed a period of clerical aggressiveness. Whether rightly or wrongly, the Catholic Church has been made to suffer for the political indiscretions of its members, as well as for its own political doctrines. Anti-clericalism is not, in spite of what has been said, in France, the work of sects of dissenters, Protestants or Jews. It is the natural product of Roman Catholic education. Its most prominent types are pupils nurtured in the bosom of the Church. Its intolerance and narrowness are essentially Roman Catholic. Edmond de Pressense put it in an epigram: "Anti-clericalism is clericalism turned around."

After all, and everything considered, anti-clericalism has been a guarantee of liberty and a refuge against a Church that has consistently and repeatedly, in cathedra and ex-cathedra, anathematized the very ideas on which rests modern civilization.

To-day, after the victories, glorious or unglorious, of the State, the French republic stands ready to hold out the olive branch to the Church that it has finally vanquished. The most conciliatory words that the Catholic Church has heard for a long time were uttered at Perigueux, in October, 1909, and often repeated since by the very man who was the leader of the majority in the vote of disestablishment and is now Prime Minister of France; and these words were a call to reconciliation and to union.

It rests with the Catholic Church now that she is rid of governmental control and governmental tyranny to live her life under the protection of a law equal for all. She has lost, through the uncompromising policy of her hierarchy, much of her property. But she has lost, also, a good deal of the dead weight that was hampering her course. Now she is free—free to assemble, free to deliberate, free to act without interference from the government. If she will only adapt herself to the new conditions, and every sign shows that she is doing it, she will find—she has already found—that the freedom that she gained is worth more than the miserable seven million dollars stipend that the State begrudgingly paid her.

As for the Protestant Churches with their 700,000 members, 854 parishes, 979 pastors, they had little to suffer from the

withdrawal of State support that many of them had been long praying for. Self-government that the Catholic Church refused to submit to as contrary to its constitution, was second nature to the descendants of the Huguenots. The \$300,000 that the State used to give them for the support of worship is not impossible to collect from a body of modest but public-spirited citizens, who already gave more than a million a year to support their institutions.

It is vain to prophesy. But if I read aright the signs of the times, the present divorce of Church and State, of temporal and spiritual things, is in France permanent. If the churches are to exert an influence on the State, they must do so indirectly through their members that they have imbued with their spirit.

They have already done so to a large extent. Many of the great movements of social betterment—movements of temperance, of public morals, of international arbitration, of Sunday rest, have originated among Christians, especially among Protestant Christians, and are accelerated by their coöperation. But it would be vain to try to enforce them as Christian measures, as was seen in the law of Sunday rest passed, thanks to the energetic intervention of the Socialist minister, Viviani, who wanted, as we have seen, to extinguish the light of heaven. Hence, if Christian principles are to make themselves felt in French legislation, they must not force themselves on the statute book as dictates of a religious creed. They must gain the good will of the people by their ever-present but invisible influence.

The Reformer's Portfolio.

By William Parsons, D.D.

Not formal discussion, but suggestion for the workers. The editor of this department invites suggestions. Address 568 E. Pine Steert, Portland, Oregon.

The Didactic Function of Law.

BY REV. WM. PARSONS, D.D.

In jurisprudence as in the word of God two clearly defined functions of law are recognizable. The first is to restrain wrongly inclined men. This it does by putting a cost mark on conduct, inimical to self or society. The second is to teach well intentioned men their duty. This second is what is rightly termed "The didactic function of law." It was of this function of the law that Burke spoke when he said, "To give a direction, a form, a technical dress, a specific sanction to the general sense of a community, is the true end of legislation." He might have added also that it is the business of legislation to define the rights and duties of men, to embody the best conceptions of the moral consciousness of a people, that by these means it may teach those less progressive, yet well intentioned portions of the community, a proper rule of conduct. In the absence of such definition and embodiment of principles the morals of any community will degenerate. Its negative power is equal to its positive potency. By its penalties it brands bad conduct as dishonorable and so creates public sentiment against it. Dr. Holland understood this when he wrote "Laws are the bulwarks of liberty, they define every man's rights and defend their individual liberties."

With this principle clearly in mind we can readily understand that in a country like ours, moral legislation, whether fundamental or statutory, ought

to keep in advance of what might be called the average moral consciousness. Its laws ought to embody the moral sentiment of the better, rather than the worse, elements of society.

In Kinkead's Jurisprudence, Law and Ethics, the author says quite emphatically, "It lies directly with the legislature to provide ways and means whereby the State shall enforce the rules of morality." I believe no one would limit this responsibility solely to the vicious elements of a community or to the modes of procedure that are to be followed by the executive. It certainly would include the duty of a legislature to so define and embody the rules of conduct, that good men would know their rights and duties. In this providence of ways and means, the education accomplished through the law is its most important task, and the one most consonant with the spirit of our institutions.

Priestly says "No people were ever better than their laws, though many have been worse." If we expect to continue a growing nation, our laws must continue to be a little better than we are. The dread expressed of late by so many vested interests and liquor orators and editors, that the law will suffer in the respect of the people because the leaders of reform are running ahead of public sentiment is largely fanciful. Such men forget this fact: good laws only become obsolete in a decadent society. We are not prepared to confess to that for our country yet. Laws which are ahead of the moral consciousness of an ethically advancing people,

become the index of its aspirations, the embodiment of its best moral sentiment and the best schoolmaster of its moral laggards.

It is far more vital to our welfare that the thinking, law abiding elements of our country respect our laws, than that the vicious elements dread them. Lose the first and revolution is imminent. If the latter be wanting it becomes a spur to better government. If good men are compelled to feel shame and contempt for the laws of their State and nation that fact will inevitably produce either a violent agitation or a deadening apathy in public sentiment. When the vicious elements despise the laws and ride rough shod over them, steady pressure by the better element will eventually triumph.

It is also a well known fact that the appeal for conformity to laws that are beneficial in their intent and tendency, has a stronger grip upon the average man than the appeal for revolution or reformation of law, which is simply another way of saying, it is easier to hunt on the sunny side of the hedge.

It was Hume who declared, that "so great is the force of laws, that consequences almost as general and as certain, may sometimes be deduced, as any which mathematical science affords us." Here he is undoubtedly referring to the moral as well as to the economic results, the effect of the law's didactic function as well as its material potency.

Two concrete applications of this will suffice. The secular attitude of the U. S. Constitution, within a century has reduced most of the newer States to the ethical basis of Hobbs. The older States stand on a Christian basis and recognize in their constitutions that of all

law it should be said "Her seat is in the bosom of God and her voice is the harmony of the world." The newer States imitated the federal constitution rather than the older States and are largely without moral foundations and are left without protection against the vicious principle, that the will of the majority is right, when once embedded in the constitution. This change has not more successfully separated Church and State as witness recent events in New Mexico, but it has added to the confusion of moral legislation.

In the light of the foregoing facts we are able also to estimate the value of the attitude of the liquor oligarchy toward advanced legislation. "You can't make men righteous by law," say they, which is, as they use it, a half truth, transformed by their use, into a whole lie. We know you can't regenerate men by law. But men always have and always can be and always will be educated by law. If law puts a wrong cost mark on occupations or conduct within a generation there will be multitudes who accept it as true, and if the law correctly marks them, within a generation the majority will regard them accordingly. Witness the prohibitory sentiment in Kansas.

They tell us that it is worse than useless to enact legislation that, having such a strong minority sentiment against it, is morally certain not to be properly enforced. To put it plainly, these men are telling us that it is worse than useless for the legislature to define the rights and duties of an individual in a matter declared by the highest courts to be inimical to the welfare of the State, until the evilly disposed minority has been reduced to acquiescence, which

is perilously near the absurdity that no law should be enacted until the need of it has passed away.

We all recognize with Wendell Phillips that "the law is nothing unless close behind it stands a warm living public sentiment." For the entire prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks, there is in every State a warm living public sentiment. Perhaps not up to the war heat, nor yet able to melt away the casings of the Booze Trusts, but sufficient to warrant the gov-

ernments of the various States defining, according to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the rights and duties of citizens in this matter; sufficient to warrant them in immediately removing the cost mark of justification from an occupation which has been branded as the chief source of crime, misery and poverty, by the best authorities in ethics, economics, sociology, law and religion. A sentiment sufficiently strong to warrant being embodied in law.

Selections

Corruption in the Pittsburgh School Boards.

An investigation of the public school system of Pittsburgh by the Voters' League, similar to its investigation of the city councils, shows the system to be even more rotten than were the councils.

This is the clear deduction from the report of the executive committee of the league to that organization made public on February 15.

That these astounding revelations are true is evidenced by the facts that the Voters' League is very thorough in its methods and careful in its statements. No one dares dispute the charges it makes. Other cities are doubtless as bad as Pittsburgh, but lack the facilities for making an adequate investigation and exposure.

A few extracts follow:

A man's occupation ought to give strong indication of his qualifications for membership on a school board. Certain occupations, such as saloonkeeper, bartender, gambler, and the like, would ordinarily be regarded as stamping a man

unfit for such service. The school laws forbid the employment of any teacher using intoxicating liquors as a beverage. Employment as ordinary laborer and in the lowest class of mill work, would naturally lead to the conclusion that such men did not have sufficient education or business training to act as school directors. Another class which should be disqualified are city and county employes, who on account of holding political positions, as a rule are unable to administer any other elective office without bias in the interest of the public.

There is still another class that should have no place on school boards, and this is the contractor, the builder, and the agent, who have contracts with school boards. Objection might also be made to small storekeepers, clerks, workmen at many trades, who by lack of educational advantages and business training, could not, no matter how honest, be expected to administer properly the affairs of an educational system, requiring special knowledge, and where millions are spent each year.

GAMBLERS ON THE BOARDS.

We find, however, that a majority of Pittsburgh's school directors come from these various disqualified classes. There are 14 bartenders and saloonkeepers; 38 directors holding public jobs; seven who have no legitimate occupation (such as professional gamblers and the like); 36 laborers, including the lowest grade of unskilled millworkers, drivers, watchmen and waiters; there are 16 contractors and builders, some of whom are engaged in public school contracting; 19 storekeepers, a majority of whom own small grocery stores; 23 workmen engaged in the various trades, such as machinists, plumbers, tailors, barbers, printers, carpenters, plasterers, etc.; five conducting small real estate and insurance businesses; 37 clerks, including bookkeepers, collectors and salesmen.

On the other hand, we find but seven men prominent throughout the city in business life; 24 in professional occupations (13 physicians, six dentists and three attorneys). Of those holding positions, such as managers, secretaries, auditors, superintendents and foremen, there are 22. The good boards being composed almost entirely of good men, few good men are left to leaven the other boards.

The following is an analysis of the membership of 28 of the 46 sub-district boards of Pittsburgh. As this report deals with the system, rather than with individuals, the designation by official number of the districts is avoided:

School picnics have become popular in recent years, especially with the lower wards of the city. It is illegal to spend school funds for such purposes. Some of these school picnics have been nothing more than drunken orgies for the direc-

tors and their dissolute and disreputable friends. Children from the schools have been taken to picnics with men and women of the underworld. They have seen drunken women from the tenderloin on the dancing platform, and gamblers plying their vocation on the grounds.

One board, this year, whose school has a small number of pupils, took many car-loads of people to its picnic,—more than three or four times the number of pupils. The guests of the board were recruited from the tenderloin,—prostitutes, gamblers and the like. The picnic of this school for years has been anticipated by the underworld as an opportunity for an annual debauch.

At another picnic, a director had charge of the distribution of entertainment tickets. When children would crowd around him in their efforts to get the tickets he became profane and cursed them loudly. A majority of the directors present were drinking heavily, and giving much of their attention to the prostitutes who were their guests. Over a thousand people were present. These picnics are paid for out of the school funds.

The stories of Pittsburgh school picnics are many. The above are but a few instances. Some picnics, of course, have been conducted properly, but many have been of the character above described. Children have been robbed of their amusement tickets, which have sometimes been sold by directors or given to their friends.

The following is from the statement of a man who admits bribing directors in every school district where he did business. He explains the easy method of getting graft from picnics as follows:

The directors would estimates that

they needed a certain number of tickets—many more than were actually required—for the picnic to cover transportation and amusements. These tickets would be issued several weeks before the picnic was held and I would receive a check from the board for the entire amount of the transaction. After the picnic had been held the directors would come to me with a certain number of tickets of various kinds that had not been used. I would take these returned tickets and pay the directors in cash the refund allowed at full rate for all those not used. The directors, of course, kept the money.

I recollect one picnic where I paid two members of a board \$500 each in this manner. In another case I paid a board \$1,400 graft. The picnic itself cost but \$1,500. The original check made out to me was for \$2,900 covering all the tickets originally purchased, for which I gave proper receipts. The directors brought this check to me after the picnic for their refund, which amounted to \$1,400. They went with me to a prominent bank, where I cashed the check for \$2,900, and then we adjourned to a saloon, where I gave them their \$1,400.

In the last 10 years expenditures for school purposes in the greater city have increased 42 per cent; from a cost of \$2,593,016.03 in 1900, to \$3,689,685.43 in 1909. During this time there has been an increase of but 14 per cent in the number of pupils; 51,466 in 1900, to 58,050 in 1909. In the 10 years the greater city has spent for school purposes \$30,508,939.23. Of this amount \$21,566,277.68 is charged to the old city, and \$8,942,661.55 to Allegheny. Pittsburgh (old city) has increased its expenditures from \$1,757,381.78 in 1900, to \$2,707,484.34 in 1909, or 54 per cent. Its school attendance has increased

from 36,184 in 1900 to 44,650 in 1909, a gain of 23 per cent.

Allegheny's expenditures have increased from \$835,634.25 in 1900, to \$982,201.09 in 1909, a gain of 17 per cent, with a loss of students from 14,314 in 1900 to 13,400 in 1909.

In Pittsburgh one sub-district increased its expenditures 258 per cent, with a loss of 26 per cent in pupils. Another district increased cost 700 per cent, with a gain of 68 pupils, which was 17 per cent of its total attendance. One district in Allegheny increased expenditures 22 per cent, with a loss in attendance of 19 per cent.

Not including teachers' salaries, books, etc., which are paid for by the Central Board, the sub-districts in the last 10 years paid out: For buildings, \$2,611,780.81; ground, \$871,106.37; permanent improvements, \$1,004,312.72; repairs, \$723,214.63; general supplies, \$319,257.31; janitors, \$1,164,388.33; other purposes (take careful note of "other purposes"), \$926,934.13.

On \$21,566,277.68 handled by the banks in Pittsburgh during 10 years, there was received in interest on deposits \$129,584. During this same 10 years \$1,067,029.18 has been paid for interest charges. During the same period the treasurers of the various boards received in salaries \$51,621.47, and the secretaries \$100,028.61. Many boards received no interest whatever on their deposits. One board for four years has been carrying a balance in the bank ranging from \$69,000 to \$77,000, and during this time has received but \$377.48 in interest. Yet it has paid out in interest \$7,560. It is the same board that last year spent \$18,158.58 for 115 pupils, which does not include the sal-

aries of its teachers, cost of text books and school supplies.

One sub-district has increased its expenditures from \$5,066.03 in 1900 to \$18,158.58 in 1909. During this same time the average daily attendance had dropped from 156 to 115 students. The question is naturally, why is it necessary to keep up a school in this district? Other schools are in close proximity and the students of this and four contiguous wards could be taken care of in one of the buildings. There are a number of sub-districts which could be abolished and a number of schools which could be abandoned. In some sub-districts it is necessary to build school houses with a view to increase of attendance, and in such cases buildings may have to be maintained for a comparatively small number of pupils. But such is not the case in many of the downtown wards.

One sub-district has spent for permanent improvement and repairs during 10 years \$26,024.84. It has spent for "other purposes" \$21,762.34, and what are these "other purposes"? The item of "other purposes" found in every school's financial report is worth watching. In many of the corrupt sub-districts it runs into larger sums every year. It is used to cover a multitude of expenditures, at the bottom of which is graft and waste.

One board with 115 pupils has spent in 10 years \$147,627.11. The finances of this district have for years been subject to severe criticism. Not only have the expenditures been far in excess of the needs of the district, but the moneys have been handled in an unbusiness-like manner. This sub-district has had during recent years the following money in bank at the end of the school year: 1904,

\$34,639.99; 1905, \$77,238.55; 1906, \$75,709.28; 1907, \$69,476.49; 1908, \$71,439.85; 1909, 69,858.72. During that time the sub-district has received in interest on these large sums of money which have been in the bank throughout the year but \$907.48. In fact, that is all the interest which has been paid to the sub-district in 10 years. Yet during the same period the board has paid its secretary and treasurer \$3,500, and has paid out in interest \$37,560. Some years ago this board sold its school property and purchased another property in the same ward. The new property is used as a cheap lodging house or hotel, and the old building is still maintained for school purposes, for which rental of \$7,200 a year is being paid.

These are samples of the school government Pittsburgh is getting. Graft, extravagance and waste predominate. The first five wards of the city spent \$74,006 last year for 1,622 pupils. One East End ward with 1,662 pupils spent but \$24,925.

But graft means more than financial loss and waste of public funds. Bad directors select poor teachers who turn out poor pupils. A teacher in the high school states that she can always tell the student coming from a ward where graft predominates. Teachers have been selected in many instances without any regard for fitness. One woman was taken out of a saloon kitchen and given a place as teacher in the schools. Another left the basement of a department store to take charge of the kindergarten work in a downtown school. A third received her training for school work as a house servant. There have been one or two teachers appointed who were so ignorant that they could scarcely write. In a few instances girls who received

their appointments purely on political or personal grounds have come to the principal of their school crying because they could not do the work required. There are a number of wards in Pittsburgh where the educational standard of teachers is so low that they are not desired as members in the Teachers' Association.

No one is more ashamed of the standing of Pittsburgh schools than the better class of teachers themselves. And Pittsburgh has many good teachers in spite of politics and graft.

Issued by authority of the executive committee.

A. LEO WEIL, President.

TENSARD DEWOLF, Secretary.

Our Young People

Uplifting Power of the Bible, An Incident in Mexico.

An American naturalist traveling and studying in Mexico writes as follows of an incident in his personal experience, and the story is well worth repeating and pondering in this three hundredth anniversary year of the received translation of our English Bible. We find the narrative in the Bible Society Record:

It was in the market place of Tingambato (a picturesque little town of Michoacan) that I found José. I had been studying bugs and birds that afternoon, and after sundown I strolled to the plaza to look at the people's faces. They seemed much the same: sullen, hopeless, resigned to a purposeless drifting. For a half hour I looked in vain for some sign of animation, some expression of humanity. Then came José.

He attracted my attention from a distance by his quick movements, and the light from a peanut-vender's torch revealed a genuinely intelligent face, which held clear and honest eyes. The boy was dressed neatly in clean clothing and wore shoes; his hat was large and well shaped, setting squarely on his head. All these small details marked him from the lounging, heavy, surly crowd that lay about the plaza in a perturbed lassitude. So I walked over to nuts were eatable.

The lad smiled and assured me that where Joe stood and asked if the pea-

there were none better, offering me a handful to try. I purchased a few cents' worth from the avernine urchin who sat at the base of a huge mountain of nuts and asked Joe to come over to one of the stone benches for a little chat. Joe was delighted and we went.

He apologized for sitting down with me; he apologized for eating with me. These simple people, when sober, apologize for treading on your shadow by moonlight. I easily forgave him and then asked questions as to his home, his life, his work, and his philosophy.

I learned of his arrival in T——, of how he had found work at the sawmill, and about his promotion to assistant storekeeper, after which there was a hammer lost, and he was discharged because he could not find it. Many little incidents of interest he told me concerning his mill life, and I encouraged him to go on.

He had returned to the mill again, and found work in another department, but the work was hard and his hands had many indurations, showing intimate acquaintance with the shovel handle. But he assured me that it was not to last long; that one who worked faithfully and well would be rewarded and put into a place of trust. He seemed very sure of this and his exposition quite surprised me.

Then he told me that if the poorer classes of Mexico City could have water, they would not patronize the *pulquerias* so much and would be much happier;

that they were not given water because the powerful ones who controlled such things as water taps for the public, were the ones who owned miles and miles, hundreds of miles, of *pulque* plants. He told me his heart went out to all these poor people who were drinking alcohol, when they would many times prefer a draft of cold water.

Many other things Joe told me, about politics, social conditions, and ethics as he understood them. A real jewel I had found among the pebbles, and I strongly desired to know the why and wherefore of this boy's character. So I questioned further, asking him if he smoked, if he ever drank, if he ate *chile* and drank coffee, as his companions did. I was greatly astonished at his negative replies, and asked him outright why?

"Oh," he said, "we have a book at our house. It is the only one in all this country hereabout. My father keeps it and reads to us on Sundays and feast days, and I read by candle light until my eyes are very tired, and in this book are many things that make one think about things. I read, and then I wonder if it is right to do this, and if it is wrong to do that, and I think it is wrong to use stimulants, because it makes one dizzy and lazy, and one cannot work well, nor keep one's temper well, nor sleep, nor be happy."

"And the name of this book?" I asked.

He seemed a bit disturbed at this question. He shifted his position and looked

around him to see if listening ears were close at hand. I expected something very mysterious indeed.

"But this book is prohibited," he said. "The *cura* would have us cut by all our friends if he knew we read in this book. We keep very quiet about it, and only our best friends know, and they come on Sundays and listen to my father read. Perhaps you, who come from Mexico, know the book. It is 'La Santa Biblia.'"

I told José that I knew something about the book, but that I should like to know more. He invited me most cordially to come to his house and see it. He was sure that it was the greatest book in all the world.

"Do you know of many other books?" I asked.

"No, but I am sure there are no others like this one—there cannot be. It makes us different from the rest of the people; we are happier, we are more healthful, we are better in every way, and I wish there were more of these books here; I wish that more might read and understand, and be *different*."

So here was the cause of the difference. This was the reason for the quicker motions, the brighter eyes, the pleasant voice, the generous confidences and open frankness. I always look for cause behind every effect, and I had found what I was looking for; so I went back to the hotel, promising José that I would see more of him, and that he should have a lamp to read by, so that his eyes would not tire so soon.

The National Reform Movement.

Pennsylvania Christian Citizenship Convention.

The fact that such a convention had been called, under the auspices of the National Reform Association and with the coöperation of representatives of various Christian organizations in the State, was announced in our issue for February. Among those who signed the call were Bishops Darlington and Mackay-Smith, of the Protestant Episcopal Church;

Dr. W. H. Roberts, secretary of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches; the Rev. Rufus W. Miller, D.D., Chairman of the Temperance Committee of the Federal Council of Churches; officers of the Pennsylvania Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Pennsylvania Lord's Day Alliance of the Philadelphia and Harrisburg Church Federations and the State and local Christian Endeavor Unions. A brief report of this con-

vention was given in these columns last month. We now present a more detailed account, giving the substance of some of the principal addresses.

The first address of the convention was delivered by the Rev. T. H. Acheson, D.D., of Pittsburgh, on the theme, "Should We Mix Religion With Politics?" The speaker disclaimed for the National Reform Association any purpose to unite Church and State, but showed that the separation of the State from religion was a wholly different proposition. The Church and the State are organizations. They can be and have been united, as in Russia and England, for example, where the chief ruler of the nation is also head of the Church. But "religion" is not an organization. It is a principle. When a family becomes a religious family that fact does not unite the Church and the family. And when a nation governs itself as a Christian nation, that fact does not unite the Church and the State. That the state ought to be religious was maintained on the ground that the nation is a moral personality, capable of doing right and of doing wrong, amenable, therefore, to moral law, and rewarded and punished for its conduct under the moral government of God. Moreover, the nations are expressly placed under the moral government of Jesus Christ as the King of kings.

From these principles, which were carefully reasoned out, the speaker showed that the Bible, in which the will of Christ is revealed to men, is the basis and the standard of human legislation on moral subjects, and ought to be acknowledged as such. Legislatures cannot, strictly speaking, originate or create laws. Their business is to ascertain and apply the laws of God. Moreover, the Church and the State, being under the same moral law and seeking the same moral ends, ought to cooperate with each other. While they should remain distinct organizations, occupying separate spheres, they ought not to be indifferent to or to antagonize each other. Such subjects as marriage and divorce, public education and the suppression of vice and crime indicate the wide field in which Church and State may cooperate to their mutual advantage and the good of men. Finally, it was shown that these Christian principles of civil government ought to find expression in the fundamental law of every Christian nation.

Dr. Acheson was followed by other speakers who were appointed to discuss the theme: "Supremacy of the Moral Interests of the State."

PUBLIC EDUCATION.

On the following day the hall was well filled during both forenoon and afternoon sessions. A report on "Public Education in Pennsylvania and Other States" was presented by T. P. Stevenson. The writer accepted the purpose of this convention, a Christian Citizenship convention, as limiting his broadly stated theme to the Christian elements of our public education. There is a class of writers and speakers who constantly assume that the secular theory of public education has been definitely accepted and put into general operation by the American people; that the Bible has been generally excluded from the public schools, and that any instances of its continued use in the school room are mere survivals of an obsolete practice and anachronisms in our present system of education. How far mistaken this view is was shown by citations from the laws of eight States, and from the constitution of one, the State of Mississippi, all of which expressly safeguard the reading of the Bible in the schools. In a large number of other States, thirteen in all, it was shown that the reading of the Bible has been upheld by decisions of the courts or of State Superintendents of Public Institution, while in fifteen States there are neither laws nor decisions against it and the matter is left to the option of teachers or of Boards of Education. The speaker recognized, however, that there is a well-defined drift toward purely secular public education in this country. Illinois is now to be added to the number of the States, seven in all, in which there are authoritative decisions against the use of the Bible in the schools. Two of these decisions, those in Wisconsin and Illinois, have been given by their Supreme Courts. The others have been by Attorneys-General or State Superintendents of Education. The secular program of education which excludes all religious ideas from the work of the school room was opposed by the speaker because:

- I. Such education is partial and defective. It cultivates certain faculties or powers, but neglects the moral sense, the conscience which is the most important because it is the regula-

tive faculty on whose right action depends the right and beneficent action of all the other powers.

2. Secular education disparages religious knowledge in comparison with other knowledge and is therefore positive education against religion.

3. Secular education does not meet the needs of the State. The State needs an intelligent citizenship, but far more she needs a conscientious and God-fearing citizenship.

4. Secular education is the logical corollary or deduction from the secular theory of government. If the nation knows no God and has no religion, it cannot teach religion in its schools. But this is not, and has never been, the theory of the American people. And if the State has its being in God as does an individual man, then it should transmit the knowledge and the fear of God to its coming generations of citizens.

5. Merely secular education violates the most sacred rights of God and of the child. If God has spoken to nations in His Word, revealing His laws and announcing the conditions of national welfare and prosperity, no national and no local authority has the right to interpose between that Word and the child and say, it shall not be heard by our children. As no father has the right to banish it from his home, no nation, no community, has the right to exclude it from its schools. And every child has the right to learn that word from those who undertake to prepare the child for the responsible duties of citizenship.

The next address was by the Rev. George E. Reed, D.D., President of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., on the theme: "The Public School and American Citizenship." Dr. Reed showed that public education is not established for the benefit of the individual citizen, but for the welfare of the State. Referring to flagrant examples of political corruption in our national life, he asked whether the schools are measuring up to the task of making the kind of citizens needed in the republic. The corrupt use of money in elections he declared to be an evil which threatens the existence of our government. The widespread evidence of this evil shows that no adequate education in the moral obligations of citizenship is given in our public schools. Citizens of all classes ought to get together to secure

such instruction in the schools as will establish reliable moral character in our future citizens.

THE PROBLEM OF INTEMPERANCE.

The next address was by Mr. Harry M. Chalfant, editor of the *American Issue*, on "The Relation of Intemperance to the Welfare of the State." From this very effective discussion we have gleaned the following passages which deserve the most thoughtful attention:

"The Pennsylvania Legislature has now before it the question whether we shall adhere to the Brooks High License Law as our method of dealing with this problem or shall, by adopting local option, allow the voters of each county or neighborhood to exclude the saloon from their territory. The Wheeling *Intelligencer*, a leading champion of the liquor forces in the State of West Virginia, recently said: 'Pennsylvania is one of the States in which prohibition agitation has not been able to secure a foothold. The sole reason is that there the licensed saloon is so limited and regulated that its most serious evils are eliminated. Eventually, similar legislation will solve everywhere the liquor question.' Let us examine these claims.

"It is asserted that the Brooks law prevents the sale of liquor in unlicensed places. But a recent report of Internal Revenue Collector Heiner, of Pittsburgh, indicates that he is collecting the United States tax in that city from about five hundred places where liquor is sold illegally. How many more 'speak easies' and 'blind tigers' in that city have probably contrived to evade the collector? A detective who has recently done much work in Pittsburgh expressed to me recently his belief that there are more than twelve hundred such places in that one municipality.

"It is claimed for the Brooks Law that it gives the people the right to say by their remonstrances whether they shall have saloons or not. But let us watch the operation of the law. Are these remonstrances heeded by the judges? The Fayette county court last year granted a license in the town of Perryopolis to the son and the son-in-law of one of the political bosses of that county, to whom the judge owed his election. On the petition were 126 names; on the remonstrance, 329. On the

petition were 28 owners of real estate; on the remonstrance, 162, and yet the judge granted the license!

"And this illustrates the effect of the Brooks law on the character of our judiciary. The liquor interests in every county plunge into every judgeship campaign. When a judge owes his election to the liquor forces he has a debt to discharge. The best lawyers refuse nominations because they would not have a free hand in administering the office. In some counties attorneys who stood high in the esteem of the community, some of them prominent in church work, have been elevated to the bench by liquor influences with disastrous results to their own character and reputation.

"The liquor interests dwell at great length on the Brooks law as a revenue producer. But the revenue derived from high license utterly fails to reimburse the State for the burden of the fruits of the saloon. It is impossible to give, in absolutely definite percentages, the proportion of the total amount of crime, poverty and insanity which is caused by the use of intoxicants. The most reliable and most extensive investigations were those made by the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor a few years ago. They studied over thirty thousand cases, and found that strong drink was the cause of 84 per cent. of the crime, 47 per cent. of the poverty and 35 per cent. of the insanity of the State. Massachusetts being largely a manufacturing State, like our own, I have based the calculations in this paper on the figures collected there. Taking ten counties in Pennsylvania as samples, we find that, on the Massachusetts percentages, these ten counties paid, to care for the crime, poverty and insanity caused by the liquor business, the sum of \$1,171,940, and received from liquor licenses \$129,526. In other words for every dollar received in revenue they paid out nine dollars to repair the damage done by the saloon.

"We have in this State very little dry territory with which to make comparisons. The only county which has been dry for any considerable time is Greene, which abolished her last saloon more than thirty years ago, and the last brewery and distillery two years ago. It costs Greene county sixty-seven dollars for each one thousand of her population to indict, convict, transport and support in jail her criminal population. The same items cost

Washington county two hundred and twenty dollars for each one thousand of her population. Or we may compare Greene and Bedford counties, both of which have rural populations nearly equal in number and living under the same general conditions. In 1909, and for many years previous, Bedford county had from twenty to thirty saloons. During 1909, 205 prisoners were admitted to the Bedford county jail as against 22 to the Greene county jail. The criminal court of Bedford county sat 22 days; that of Greene county, seven days. Four days of these seven were occupied in the trial of a man who had gotten drunk in another county, and had crossed over and committed a murder in Greene.

"Out of thirty sudden deaths in Washington county the report of the coroner sets down four as due to liquor. Out of fourteen persons drowned four lost their lives directly as the result of intoxication. Thirteen railroad trespassers and one trolley victim came to their death directly as the result of drink. Four suicides were purely the result of the same. Here we have a record of thirty-three sudden or accidental deaths in one county in one year due to liquor, or one to every 4,300 people. Greene county shows one sudden or violent death due to drink during the same period, or one to every 28,000 people."

The speaker's conclusion was that high license is a failure in regulating liquor traffic and abating its evil results, and that Christian citizens in Pennsylvania should work steadily and resolutely for the state-wide abolition of the saloon. The ultimate solution of the saloon problem is no saloon.

The convention next listened to a brief but vigorous address on the same theme by Mrs. Parsels, lecturer of the Pennsylvania W. C. T. U.

In the afternoon of Tuesday a report was read from the pen of the Rev. Dr. R. C. Wylie on "Our Sabbath Laws," and the Rev. J. S. Martin discussed clearly and convincingly the relation of the State to Jesus Christ.

THE DIVORCE PROBLEM.

In view of the fact that the Uniform Divorce Law, framed by the Congress in Divorce Reform which was called by Governor Pennypacker, of this State, and adopted and

recommended by the Commissioners on Uniform Laws, is now pending again before the Pennsylvania Legislature, much attention was given in this convention to this subject. Mr. Walter George Smith, an eminent lawyer of Philadelphia, who was a member of the Congress referred to and chairman of its Committee on Resolutions, and who is the second member of the Commission on Uniform Laws for Pennsylvania, delivered the first address. Mr. Smith is a member of the Roman Catholic Church, a fact to which he referred in his opening sentence, saying that he held views on the subject different, probably, from the opinions of most of his audience. He recited the steps by which the movement for divorce reform has been advanced to its present stage, the collection of the statistics of the evil first by the Department of Labor and more recently by the census office; the horror and alarm caused by the great number and rapid increase of divorces which these figures revealed; the efforts to secure uniform laws and the fact that the law now pending in Pennsylvania has been adopted by New Jersey, Delaware and Wisconsin, and is embodied substantially in the laws of Illinois. The following earnest words show the high principles which determine the speaker's view of the marriage tie. "The chivalry of the American Legislator has led him to overlook the evil to society from the undermining of family life, the crushing influence upon innocent children, and the effect upon general reverence in the community for the supreme commands of God. The ideal of duty faithfully performed, even though its performance costs all the years of life, an ideal inculcated by the Founder of Christianity, has given way to the notion that happiness is the right of the individual, and that he or she may be relieved by a legislature of an obligation which was deliberately and solemnly assumed, to be carried out 'in sickness and in health, in poverty and riches,' until death has dissolved it." "Those who believe as a religious principle that divorce with the privilege of remarriage is essentially contrary to the law of God; those who believe that divorce should be permitted for adultery alone; those who believe that our present system is based on a correct theory, but who are opposed to the perpetration of fraud under the forms of law, can all unite in support of this

proposed act, leaving to the future advance of religious and ethical education the next step toward the ideal which they have in view." The closing words of the speaker were these: "Perhaps society will one day see that, irrespective of the claims of religion upon the consciences of all men, the preservation of society itself will require the abolition of all causes for absolute divorce."

Mr. Smith was followed by the Rev. Dr. H. C. Minton, of New Jersey, who also was a member of the Divorce Reform Congress by appointment of the governor of New Jersey, in a thoughtful and eloquent address on "Who are the Parties to a Divorce?" With cogent arguments he showed that besides the man and the woman, who are popularly considered the only parties, the children, if they have any, are also parties with a deep interest in the transaction. So also is the state, which sanctioned their marriage and whose consent must be obtained for its dissolution. Above all, God, who has instituted the marriage relation, and given the moral laws by which it is to be regulated, is a party in every divorce case. His rights are paramount, and He will assuredly vindicate them.

The Rev. J. S. McGaw, the National Field Secretary of the National Reform Association, then made a stirring plea for interest in the next World's Christian Citizenship Conference and for timely preparations to attend it. Several persons signed cards pledging themselves to labor to have the societies with which they are connected represented in that Conference.

T. P. S.

The American Social Compact Theory of Government.

BY R. C. WYLIE, LL.D.

Doctor Brownson, in his work entitled "The American Republic," says that the Social Compact theory of government "has been, and perhaps is yet, generally accepted by American politicians and statesmen, at least so far as they ever trouble their heads with the question at all, which it must be confessed is not far" (p. 43).

It is generally agreed among writers on political science, whatever their views as to the

origin of civil government, that there is a compact of some kind entering into the political framework, however much they may disagree as to its nature and the place it occupies. There was such a compact entered into when the government of the Hebrew Commonwealth was organized, as is clear from the records in the book of Exodus. Dr. Brownson says: "The moral theologians of the Church have generally spoken of government as a social pact or compact, and explained the reciprocal rights and obligations of subjects and rulers by the general law of contracts; but they have never held that government originates in a voluntary agreement between the people and their rulers, or between the several individuals composing the community. They have never held that government has only a conventional origin and authority" (pp. 43, 44). When in 1651 Charles II took an oath to defend the Church of Scotland, and to observe and keep both the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant there was furnished an example of a compact between the King and the people.

When the Social Compact theory of government is under consideration, however, no such compact as this is the subject of thought. Rather is it a compact that is supposed to antedate all such transactions and which precedes the existence of civil government itself.

The most prominent names associated with the Social Compact theory are Thomas Hobbes (*The Leviathan*, 1651), John Locke (*Two Treatises on Civil Government*, 1689), and Jean Jacques Rousseau (*The Social Contract*, 1762).

Other men of note who supported the theory on the other side of the Atlantic were Grotius, Puffendorf, Spinoza and Milton. The three first named, however, are generally regarded as the chief exponents of the theory.

As stated by Brownson many American statesmen and politicians adopted the theory in one form or another. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams both advocated it, and it is generally supposed to be the basis of the government of the United States and of the several States of which the Union is composed. This is a matter which deserves careful attention. It has never been examined with the critical care which it merits. The sources of information are the organic laws of the nation

and of the several States of the Union and the writings of the prominent men who participated in the founding of this Republic.

An adequate theory of civil government must be able to give a satisfactory answer to

to all the important questions which arise concerning the State. It must give an account of

the origin of Man's political nature. It must tell whether it belongs to man as man, or whether it is the result of an evolutionary process. It must account for the existence of men in society. Not only must it tell how this or that particular society arose, but it must account for society in general, and inform us why men always live in society and not as detached individuals. It must tell us how it comes about that there is such a thing as authority among men exercised through the machinery of civil government. It must give an account of the origin of civil government itself. It is not enough for it to tell how certain nations and governments came into being in the historical progress of the world, but it must show the origin of civil government as an institution apart from any existing or previously existing government. It must trace to its ultimate source what is known as political sovereignty. Any theory that fails to do these things satisfactorily fails to grasp some of the fundamental principles of civil government and should give place to some other theory.

Thomas Hobbes assumed that in their state of nature men live outside of all society. He

does not allow the ex-

THEORY OF HOBBS istence even of what men call natural society.

Every man's hand is against every other man. Every man has a right to everything, and as long as this right endures there can be no security to any one. Since life is the first of human desires, and since its tenure is very uncertain in this state of constant warfare, there is a natural law which, putting a restraint upon this natural liberty, prompts men to make it more secure. Each man, therefore, becomes willing to give up this natural right to all things, and to be content with so much liberty as he is willing that others shall have. The state arises from this natural desire to escape from the natural condition of war.

Each man makes a covenant with each, and each with all, that they will give up their right to govern themselves. They select a common power, either one man or an assembly of men, preferably one man, to whom they submit their wills. The multitude being thus united in one person is called a commonwealth. This, says Hobbes, "Is the generation of that great Leviathan, or rather, to speak more reverently, of that mortal god, to which we owe under the immortal God, our peace and defence." Since this man to whom they agree to submit their wills is not a party to the covenant, he can never break it. His power is absolute in all things pertaining to the welfare of the state. Opposition to the government is always unjustifiable and wrong. This theory was devised in the interest of absolute monarchy.

Locke held that the state of nature was not at all such as Hobbes described it. He held that natural society al-

THEORY OF LOCKE ways existed. In that state there was natural law which regulated natural liberty, but there was no governing body to execute it. Every man had the natural right to execute the natural law in his own behalf for the preservation of life and property. But the difficulty of this being done satisfactorily led to the formation of civil society and the establishment of civil government. In so doing each man surrendered his natural right to enforce natural law in his own behalf and conferred it upon the civil society thus formed, which society proceeds to set up a form of government. When this is done a second compact is made between each individual and the designated bearers of civil authority, the latter agreeing to promote the common welfare and the former to yield faithful obedience. "There is in this conception nothing of that absolute, unlimited and uncontrollable sovereignty which was the soul of Hobbes' system. The natural rights of the individual limit the just powers of the sovereign community precisely as they limited, in the state of nature, the just powers of other individuals.

Rousseau agreed neither with Hobbes nor with Locke as to the state of nature and the steps taken to emerge

THEORY OF ROUSSEAU from it. He held that originally it was an ideal state, and that were it not for the obstacles which interfere with his

enjoyment of it, which obstacles grow more powerful than the forces which each individual can employ to maintain himself in it, nothing better could be desired. Man is driven, however, by these obstacles to relinquish his natural, unlimited right to everything he is able to obtain, and to find a form of association which may defend and protect with all the force of the community, the person and property of each associate and by which each, being united to all, yet only obeys himself and remains as free as he was before." The substance of the contract he defines thus: "The total alienation of each associate with all his rights to the entire community—for, first, each giving himself entirely, the condition is the same for all, and the conditions being the same for all, no one has an interest in making it onerous for others." "The alienation being without reserve, the union is as complete as it can be, and no associate has anything to claim." "Finally, each giving himself to all, gives himself to none; and as there is not an associate over whom he does not acquire the same right as is ceded, an equivalent is gained for all that is lost, and more force to keep what he has." He sums up the essentials of the contract as follows: "Each of us gives in common his person and all his force under the supreme direction of the general will; and we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole."

This act of association produces a moral and collective body composed of as many members as the assembly has votes. This public personage thus formed is called the State. It has life, intelligence and will. It has sovereign power. This sovereignty is indivisible and cannot be delegated. No second compact is made between it and the individual members of society. The will of this sovereign body is enacted into law, not by representatives but by the direct act of the body itself. Whoever will not obey its will is to be compelled to obey, that is, forced to be free.

The will of this sovereign body is always right. It cannot err. It may be deceived, and it is only then that it seems to desire what is evil.

Rousseau bases the right to take life as a punishment for crime on the right of every man to risk his own life to preserve it. "It

is for the sake of not being killed by an assassin that we consent to be killed, if we become assassins." A further explanation is this: every malefactor is in reality in a state of war against the state. He is no longer a citizen. The preservation of the state and the preservation of the malefactor are incompatible. One or the other must perish. A little clear thinking will lead to the conclusion that these explanations do not explain. Such an absolute right over life does not exist. To kill all who are in a state of war against the state is not common nor allowable.

With this brief outline of these several theories of the Social Compact before us, let us inquire which, if any, was followed in the construction of our State and National government. It is to be remembered that the authors of these theories taught them for the purpose of accounting for the then existing governments or for laying a basis for what they might regard as necessary modifications. They were not theories which were before men's minds for adoption or rejection while laying plans for the founding of nations and governments. But they became popular just when the American governments were in the formative period, and it is certain that they, one, if not all of them, exercised some influence in the formation of the framework of our State and National governments.

The Constitutions of the different States will be examined first. That of Massachusetts was formed in 1780. It

STATE CONSTITUTION EXAMINED

contains the following clauses: "The body politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals, it is a social compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good."

The Constitution of Connecticut declares "That all men, when they form a compact, are equal in rights and that no man or set of men are entitled to exclusive public emoluments or privileges from the community. That all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their benefit."

The Constitution of Kentucky says, "All men, when they form a social compact, are equal. . . . All power is inherent in the people,

and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety, happiness, and the protection of property. For the advancement of these ends, they have at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to alter, reform or abolish their government in such manner as they may deem proper."

The Constitution of Maryland declares "That all government of right is founded in compact only, and instituted solely for the good of the whole."

In the Constitution of New Hampshire we read that "All men are born equally free and independent; therefore all government of right originates from the people, is founded in consent, and instituted for the general good. When men enter into a state of society they surrender up some of their natural rights to that society in order to insure the protection of others; and without such an equivalent the surrender is void."

The Constitution of Oregon says: "We declare that all men when they form a social compact are equal in rights; that all power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety and happiness."

These six are the only ones that mention the formation of government by a social compact. It is not clear in every case where they place this compact. That is, whether it is a compact whereby civil society itself is formed, or a compact whereby a civil government is established. In the cases of Massachusetts and New Hampshire there is no doubt but that the reference is to the formation of civil society itself. Perhaps it will be safe to assume that this is meant in the cases of the other four. It will be in order to determine at a later stage of the discussion whether it was the theory of Hobbes, or of Locke, or of Rousseau that the framers of these documents followed.

There are expressions in most of the other State Constitutions which might be understood as embodying some form of the Social Compact theory. Many of them contain such language as this from the Constitution of Alabama. "That all men are equally free and independent; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

"That all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their benefit; and that, therefore, they have at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to change their form of government in such manner as they may deem expedient." The constitutions of Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia and Wyoming, contain the same idea in almost the same language. The Constitution of Colorado declares that "All political power is vested in and derived from the people; that all government of right originates from the people, is founded on their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole." The Constitutions of Mississippi, Missouri and Montana contain the same language. The Constitutions of Illinois and Nebraska quote from the Declaration of Independence as follows: "We declare that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights and the protection of property, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Similar to this is the statement in the Constitution of Wisconsin. The Constitution of Louisiana declares that "All government of right originates with the people, is founded on their will alone and is instituted for the good of the whole." The following already classified above, in addition to the statement that political power is inherent in the people likewise, says that it is vested in the people: North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia. The Constitution of New York contains no statement that has any bearing on the question.

It is quite apparent that there are expressions in many, if not all, these constitutions that are objectionable.

CRITICISM OF CONSTITUTIONS To say that all free government is founded on the authority of the people or on their authority only, as is done in a number of cases is, to say the least, the ignor-

ing, if not the denying of the fact that the authority of God lies back of all human authority. But is it clear that this is what the framers of these documents meant? In fact, in many cases it is almost certain that they did not mean this. They meant to deny the divine right of kings or of any select class of men who have been supposedly commissioned by God to establish civil government. They meant to declare that this right in some way belongs to the people as a body and not to a select few or to some one specially appointed by God. To correct the error involved in such expressions, the word "only" should be eliminated wherever it occurs in such clauses, and it should be declared that governments are established on the authority of the people derived from God.

A word is necessary with reference to the expressions "all political power is inherent in the people," or "inherent and vested in the people." The question arises as to the manner in which it came to be there. Does it inhere as an essential characteristic of the people? If so it would seem that the creative act of God placed it there. Even some of the Constitutions which speak of the formation of a social compact likewise speak of political power being inherent in the people. This is the case with the constitutions of Connecticut, Kentucky and Oregon. The term people does not denote individuals outside civil society. It denotes a political body. The statement, therefore, is inconsistent with any theory of social compact. The expression, "power is vested in the people," is ambiguous. Who vested it there? If individuals had political power as individuals, the surrender of it to the body politic formed by the compact would so vest it. But if the thought is that it was vested there by God who alone has all power and authority, the language is out of harmony with all theories of social compact. To say the least, the framers of these documents were not sufficiently careful to use language altogether free from ambiguity. Doubtless most of them had no well defined political philosophy. They caught up certain popular phrases and used them without sufficient regard for their full significance. They were anxious to steer clear of the old heresies of the divine right of kings, the divine right of monarchy, and the union of Church and State. But the

very fact that in all these constitutions there are acknowledgments, indicates that they did not regard their theory of government, in so far as they had a theory antagonistic to the belief in God.

Thomas Jefferson is usually regarded as the author of the Declaration of Independence.

He is also supposed to have been a disciple of Rousseau, and to have thoroughly accepted his theory of the social compact. The clause in the Declaration which is often quoted as embodying this theory is the following: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

The National Constitution is also regarded as based upon the theory of Social Compact.

This is argued from its preamble, which reads thus: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain this Constitution for the United States of America."

In determining what elements of social compact are found in these two documents we will also be able to determine whether or not their framers copied after Hobbes, Locke or Rousseau.

Justice James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, was one of the signers of the Constitution. His

lectures on Jurisprudence have not received the attention in late years which they merit. He repudiates bodily the theory of Hobbes.

He maintains strenuously the proposition that society is natural to man. In so doing he voices what he believed to be the sentiment of the American people. It is no less clear that he rejected the theory of Rousseau. He contends earnestly, however, that there is a compact at least implied in the formation of civil society and in the establishment of civil government. We quote as follows: "In order to constitute a State it is indispensably necessary that the wills and the power of all the members be united in such manner that they shall never act nor desire to do but one and the same thing, in whatever relates to the end for which the society is established. It is from this union of wills and of strength that the State or body politic results. The only rational and natural method, therefore, of constituting a civil society, is by the convention or consent of the members who compose it. For by a civil society we properly understand the voluntary union of persons in the same end, and in the same means requisite to obtain that end" (Vol. 1, pp. 271, 272). It would be a rash act to pass hasty judgment on these words of Justice Wilson, as many may be inclined to do. There is a certain very orthodox church whose testimony contains the statement that "It is the will of God, revealed by the constitution of human nature, and more clearly in the sacred Scriptures, that his rational creatures, living together in one part of the world, and connected by a common interest, and by common duties should enter into a civil association. . . . It is the duty of all men voluntarily to form civil societies, establishing such authority as may best tend to preserve order," etc. The same kind and degree of social compact is embodied in this creed as is embodied in the quotation from Justice Wilson, which he maintains is the theory of the American government. His aim is to exhibit the human side of the State and to show that men act voluntarily in its establishment. He quotes an ancient writer as follows to set forth the divine side of government: "Nothing which is exhibited on our globe is more acceptable to that divinity who governs the whole universe than these communities and assemblages of men which, lawfully assembled—*jure societati*—are denominated states."

The part of Justice Wilson's theory that seems open to the most severe criticism is that

which relates to the basis of governmental authority. His view is that the inhabitants of the colonies, in declaring that all men are created equal and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, set forth the true theory according to which consent by the individual subjects is the ground on which obedience can be exacted. It is true that it is by consent or agreement that any body of men are empowered either to enact or enforce law. Without some sort of agreement they would have no more power than any other body of men would have unless we accept the theory of divine right. If, as some contend, all that is meant by these expressions is that it is by a compact that any lawmaking body exists and has power to enact law, the contention is true, but it is unhappily stated. It is through the people from God that men in office are clothed with governmental power. The people thus viewed are the sovereign political body holding their authority from God. But the governed, an expression requiring us to view men as individual subjects, not as a sovereign body, are under obligation to obey whether they assent or not.

As to the National Constitution, whatever of the theory of social compact is embodied in it is rather of a negative than of a positive character. All that it asserts about the province of the people in establishing civil government is true, but it is only one side of the truth. The omission of all reference to the source from which the authority is derived for ordaining the constitution is in harmony with the social compact rather than with the Christian theory of civil government. The half truth, therefore, borders on falsehood of a dangerous kind.

It is pertinent to inquire whether the social compact theory is essentially atheistic. In the broad and general sense of that term it is not. Thomas Hobbes, one of the first to set forth the theory in a clear-cut form, though often called an atheist, was a Christian. All his life long he was a member of the established Church of England. He resented the imputation of being heretical. Locke was also a Christian. The State constitutions in which this theory is avowed contain acknowledgments of God. While the theory is not atheistic in the general sense, it is atheistic in the

political sense. It does not connect civil government with God, or Jesus Christ or the divine law.

This investigation leads to the conclusion that there are some elements of the social compact theory in our governments both State and National. But it is the theory of Locke rather than that of Hobbes or Rousseau. While this theory has been discarded by all writers on Political science it still makes itself felt in this Republic.

What may be called the American theory of the Social Compact may be summed up in seven propositions.

ELEMENTS OF THE AMERICAN THEORY It postulates, not a pre-social, but a pre-political condition in which men are supposed to live without civil government.

Men emerge from this pre-political state by their own voluntary act, so that political society is a wholly voluntary association.

By thus placing undue emphasis upon the voluntary act of men in forming political society, the act of God in giving existence to nations is largely overlooked and is given no prominent place in political science.

While the ordaining of any given civil government is properly regarded as the voluntary act of men they are very improperly spoken of as being the ultimate source of the authority with which the government is clothed, and their will the ultimate ground on which that authority rests.

There is, therefore, an implied denial of the divine source of the authority with which government is clothed; political sovereignty is regarded as created by the surrender of individual sovereignty instead of being supreme political authority delegated by God to the people.

This theory finds no place for the law of God as the supreme law for Nations and governments, but the will of the people is supreme.

The authority of Jesus Christ over nations finds no place in this theory.

All earnest and sincere Christian citizens should combine to eliminate this theory from our governments, both State and National. This can be done by first of all removing all expressions which embody this theory. This elimination should be accompanied by the introduction of suitable recognitions of that di-

vine authority under which the people have the right to ordain constitutions; by declarations of national submission to the "Higher Law"; and by the acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of Nations.

An Appeal in Behalf of a Slave.

BY F. F. DELONG.

In previous issues of the STATESMAN, facts were published concerning the woman rescued from the Chicago Convent. We herewith present other facts, also an appeal which ought to reach the hearts of lovers of liberty. Miss Hattie Holmes, a Protestant girl of Michigan, twenty-three years ago was deceitfully induced to enter a Chicago Convent. A few months ago her sister secured her release and brought her to her home in Lansing. In a long personal interview, Miss Holmes told the writer that she was glad she was out of the Convent and nothing in the world would induce her to return. A few months ago she suddenly and mysteriously disappeared from the hotel where she was working. A personal investigation by the writer revealed the facts that a Catholic priest and Catholic women had been with Miss Holmes and threatened her with horrible punishment, both temporal and eternal, if she did not return to the Convent. Shortly after Miss Holmes disappeared, a statement came to a Lansing paper, said to have been signed by Miss Holmes, to the effect that she was back in the Convent, was happy and wished to stay there.

Reader, in order that you may understand this statement, you should consider the following facts: Before Miss Holmes was released from the Convent the Mother Superior compelled her to sign a statement to the effect that she had always been happy in the Convent. Also other girls have testified in courts that they were compelled to sign such statements before being allowed to leave. Now, to sum up this case in a few words: The Convent in Chicago is a money-making coöperation and a prison, where hundred of women and girls are held against their wills, worked like slaves and compelled to be Catholics. Hattie Holmes was thus held and treated for twenty-three years. When she was rescued, her hair was white and the best years of her life gone. Had she kept her mouth shut con-

cerning the Convent, they might have allowed her to spend her remaining years in liberty. But she told her story and sued for damages, and in order to silence her tongue and prevent the damage suit, they treacherously got her back. She is there to-day, languishing behind high walls, barred windows and locked doors, in worse slavery than any colored man ever suffered prior to the Civil War. Her sister's heart is breaking, and she has appealed to me to help rescue her sister. Money is absolutely necessary, as her sister and other relatives are extremely poor. We are fully prepared to prove that Miss Holmes always was weak-minded, and that her twenty-three years of slavery there have only added to her mental weakness. The plan now is to secure the appointment of a guardian for her, secure her release and continue suit for damages. Able lawyers have been employed and witnesses are ready to testify. One thing only is lacking, viz.: money. I am not physically able to go out personally and solicit money, hence I appeal to you through the STATESMAN. If a great many will send small contributions, we will win the greatest case against Rome's prisons ever won in America, and hasten the day when all such slaves shall be free. Please send contributions to Mrs. Carrie Barker, Evart, Michigan, Route 1. Mrs. Barker is Miss Holmes's sister, and a noble Christian woman, and every cent received will be legitimately used.

Reader, will you please respond to this appeal as soon as you read it? If you desire further information, write me or Rev. J. T. Le Gear, pastor First M. E. church, Lansing, Michigan.

If this were *your girl* how much money would you want me to contribute to get her out?

Yours for the freedom of Hattie Holmes,
F. F. DELONG.

Items of News.

A HUNDRED copies of the Report of the World's Christian Citizenship Conference are yet on hands. Price, \$1.25, postpaid.

NEGOTIATIONS are pending for a County National Reform Convention to be held in Butler, Pa., the 15th and 16th of May.

THE REV. F. F. DELONG, who has been serving our Association as Secretary for the past

year or more, has been compelled to resign on account of ill health.

REV. J. S. MARTIN, General Superintendent, addressed a meeting of the citizens of Homestead, Pa., the evening of March 14, on "The Bible in Our Public Schools."

BOTH the National Field Secretary and General Superintendent have been engaged to deliver addresses at the annual Christian Endeavor Convention of Green county, Pa., to be held in Waynesburg, June 1 and 2, next.

THE Executive Committee of the National Reform Association is at present endeavoring to secure able legal counsel in Illinois as to the best method of procedure to secure, if possible, the reversal of the Supreme Court decision of that State against the use of the Bible in the schools.

THE REV. J. M. WYLIE, D.D., pastor of a congregation in Greeley, Colo., who has been acting as Secretary for the National Reform Association in the West, has accepted a call to a pastorate in Kansas City. His coming to the State of Kansas will greatly strengthen the force of National Reform workers there.

WE are glad to be able to announce that the Executive Committee of the Association has elected a new Secretary, the Rev. W. J. Wilson, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal church in Hillsdale, Mich., county seat of the State. Mr. Wilson has signified his intention to accept and will begin work in the early fall if not sooner.

OUR National Field Secretary addressed a men's brotherhood meeting in the Methodist Episcopal church the evening of March 15 in Burlington, Iowa, en route to Kansas. He also addressed a Teachers' Institute at McLouth, Kans., the afternoon of the 18th of March, and preached in Winchester, Kans., the 19th, addressing a union meeting of the churches at one of the services on Sabbath.

THE General Superintendent recently spent a week in Mercer county, at which time he spoke in the Presbyterian, United Presbyterian and Methodist churches in Mercer, and did some preliminary work preparatory to the effecting of a Mercer County National Re-

form Association. Arrangements for his work there were made by the Rev. J. S. Duncan, one of the Vice Presidents of the Pennsylvania State National Reform Association.

ARRANGEMENTS are being perfected for a Kansas State National Reform Convention in Topeka, the Capitol of the State, April 25 and 26. The Rev. J. S. McGaw, National Field Secretary, is now in Topeka working in the interests of this Convention. All readers of the STATESMAN in the State of Kansas are earnestly requested not only to attend this convention but also to use their influence to have others in their respective communities attend and participate in the convention. Earnest prayer is also asked of all for the success of the convention and the cause represented by it.

THREE THOUSAND four hundred and forty-three National Reform letters have been sent out from the office during the past month, 125 of which were separately dictated, the remaining 3,318 being circular letters of ten different kinds. In addition to the above, 200 postal cards were issued, 554 copies of the report of the proceedings of the World's Christian Citizenship Conference mailed, 215 lists of the publications of the Association sent out, besides hundreds of copies of the various tracts or documents issued by the Association. \$467.29 was received through the office.

The Annual Christian Citizenship Conference of the Allegheny County W. C. T. U. and the National Reform Association is to be held in the Eighth Street Reformed Presbyterian church the afternoon and evening of April 11. Among the themes to be discussed are: "The Christian Citizen," by Dr. J. S. Leland, of Pittsburgh; "The Defense of the Sabbath," by Dr. T. T. Mutchler, Secretary of the Pennsylvania Lord's Day Alliance, Philadelphia; "Woman as a Factor in the Christian Citizenship Movement," by Mrs. H. H. George, President of the Pennsylvania State W. C. T. U., and "Echoes from the Harrisburg Christian Citizenship Convention," by the Rev. C. F. Longaker, of Zelienople, Pa. The Question Box is to be conducted by J. S. Martin, General Superintendent of the National Reform Association.